

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 1

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© January 15, 1996

## Research Budgets Uncertain as 2nd Shutdown Ends

Shut out of its offices and labs for a month by politics and snow, the Washington science establishment last week was attempting, with difficulty, to assess its condition and near-term future. No one was confident of either.

With the fiscal year one-quarter gone, many research budgets yet to come down from Capitol Hill, several vetoes, and the White House and Congress in a continuous snarling match, science affairs have been rendered unusually inscrutable. The uncertainty is compounded by the strong possibility that when temporary budget legislation, under a continuing resolution enacted by Congress on January 5, runs out on January 26, another shutdown will be enforced on the many still-budgetless agencies.

Among them are the National Science Foundation, NASA, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Interior and Commerce Departments with their many scientific and technical agencies, and even the White House Office of Science and

losing 2.7 percent increase. The expectation was that the two chambers would split the difference, as they often do, but a conference to match up the bills was never held.

However, when House and Senate Republicans agreed to an emergency restoration of some government services, with funding extending through the remainder of the fiscal year, Porter moved quickly to include NIH and CDC—with the House figure for NIH written into the favored list. The hurried floor procedure in both houses glossed over the absence of the customary conference agreement to iron out differences between the two bills. This left some Congressmen fuming about the opacity of the package of government-reopening legislation that was whizzing through the House in a frenzied night session on January 5.

Rep. David Obey (D-Wisc.) declared, "There is no Mem-  
(Continued on Page 3)

### *NSF Violence Research Approved—P. 5* *Drumming up Support for NIH—P. 6*

Technology Policy. All are veterans, with many other government agencies, of six-days of budget shutdown in November, plus another 21 days that began December 15, and then four days of snow-induced shutdown of their Washington-area offices in January. The Departments of Energy, Agriculture, and Defense yielded to the snow, but with their budgets for the present fiscal year passed by Congress and signed by the President, they are operating on normal terms.

The research sector of the government shutdown does, however, have a pair of Cinderellas—the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Both were among a handful of federal agencies that were targeted, or "cherry-picked," as some called it, for full-year funding January 5, when Congress and the White House yielded a bit to concerns about interruptions of vital federal programs.

During the hub-bub and confusion over the high-speed legislative tactics that the Republican leadership employed in fleeing the onus of heartlessness, the friends of NIH grabbed the opportunity and won a plump budget increase that was previously considered unattainable, 5.7 percent, bringing the budget up to about \$11.9 billion.

In a rare achievement in the opening year of the anti-deficit Republican Revolution, that's the figure that was pushed through the House last summer by NIH's devoted shepherd on Capitol Hill, Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.), who chairs the NIH Appropriations Subcommittee. When its turn with NIH came along, the Senate, however, voted a ground-

## In Brief

Little is evident about the science and technology preferences of Rep. James Sensenbrenner, of Wisconsin, Republican heir apparent for Chairman of the House Science Committee when Rep. Bob Walker (R-Pa.) retires at the end of this year. Sensenbrenner, a longtime member of the Committee and Chairman of the Space and Astronautics Subcommittee, is not a sci/tech enthusiast or a Gingrich confidant, à la Walker. Perhaps most notable: In 1994, Sensenbrenner was rated the nation's "top spending cutter" by the conservative National Taxpayers Union Foundation, according to the *Almanac of American Politics*.

*Walker's surprise retirement announcement after just one year as Science Chairman still evokes puzzlement. Following nearly two decades in the minority, he visibly relished the power and pomp of the Chairmanship, an appropriate role, he said, for a self-described "technocrat." Occupying a safe seat, Walker, age 53, cheerfully told a press conference that there's no "hidden agenda" to his departure plans. He said he just wants to do something else, but hasn't decided what.*

With Walker suddenly converted to lame-duck status, the fading chances for his main pet project, a US Department of Science, fade even further. Since Republicans are indifferent to the idea, and the White House is opposed, it's going nowhere.

*Presidential vetoes of money bills have hit the federal research sector especially hard—and ironically, it's mainly non-science items in the bills that inspired rejection. As a result, still off in limbo are bills that finance NSF, NOAA, NASA, NIST, EPA, and others. Under the rules, spending must be kept at '95 levels or less until final passage.*

# Requiem for the Government: The Children's Hour

Daddy, what was the government?

That was something they had before you were born. Everybody had to send some money to Washington, and then the people there used it to pay for building roads and for doctors and nurses for poor people and to run museums. All sorts of other things, too. And that's what was called the government.

What's a museum?

It's a little hard to explain if you haven't seen one. But they're big buildings where they used to show lots of old stuff, like famous paintings and strange rocks and odd insects and airplanes. And people would walk around and look at all of it. But that was long ago.

How odd. Didn't they have television?

Yeah, but some people liked to look at things close up. It's a matter of personal preference, I suppose.

So, why did they stop having the government?

Well, some people felt the government was wasting money, and they got angry about it. They even said the people who worked for the government had pointy heads.

## 'Pointy Heads'

Pointy heads? How gross.

That was just a joke they made about the government, but they felt the government wasted a lot of money. Like they said the government spent hundreds of dollars to buy a toilet seat.

Hundreds of dollars for a toilet seat. Why did they do that?

Oh, it was a mistake or a special problem. I don't remember exactly. But they didn't always waste money. Some people felt the government did some good things, too.

Like what?

It's hard to remember everything. Let's see. They checked on medicines to make sure they did what they were supposed to do. Oh, yeah, and when there was a big hurricane that did a lot of damage, they'd send people to help out.

Did you give money to the government?

Sure. Back then, they had something called taxes. Every year you'd add up all the money you made and send part of it to Washington. You could go to jail if you didn't send enough.

That's so unfair. I mean, if people want to walk around and look at old pictures and funny bugs, they should pay for it with their own money. And it's sad about the poor people not having money for the doctor, but they shouldn't take your money for that. The poor people should use their own money. Or borrow it from somebody.

A lot of people felt that way and that's why they changed the system. But still, some people thought that some of the stuff was okay. Like helping out after hurricanes.

## Not Fair

But, Daddy, it's not fair if they make you send in your money or go to jail. The hurricane isn't your fault. And,

besides, they should have gotten out of the way when the hurricane was coming.

Well, that's another story—there used to be something called the Weather Service. But you're right about paying for it when it's not your fault. People came around to seeing it that way.

How did they change it?

There were many people who were against giving their money to the government, and they got elected to Congress, and they changed the rules so everyone can keep their own money.

What's Congress?

## The Fate of Congress

It used to be a big group of people chosen from all over the country, and they'd come to Washington and make plans about spending the government's money.

What happened to them?

A lot of them used to be chosen year after year, but then they decided to have what they called term limits and they could only come for a few years and then someone else would get a chance. And then they had seat limits, and so Congress got smaller and smaller.

Where is it now?

It's still there, but they decided they didn't need all the space they had. They fired most of their helpers and sold the buildings and now they meet in a hotel a couple of times a year. Remember the Capitol Hill Disneyland that we visited, and the big old building with the white dome? That's where they used to have their meetings.

You mean right around where we bought all those old books?

Right. From the sale at what they used to call the Library of Congress.

Daddy, I remember. Isn't that now called Barnes and Noble?

Right again.

What did they mean in the old days about government shutdown?

Nothing to worry about now. There's nothing left to shut down.—DSG

© 1996, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher  
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher  
Wanda J. Relf

Circulation Manager  
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$490.00 (two years, \$840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## ... Hurried Legislation Creates New Uncertainties

(Continued from Page 1)

ber of this House, including the main sponsor of this proposal, who can tell you what it is you are going to be voting on tonight." Obey was answered by the sponsor, Rep. David Drier (R-Calif.), who said that "some programs are essential and many are non-essential, and we are moving ahead with the essential ones." The assertion, however, was not accompanied by explanation, and in the end, Congress approved a big grab-bag of items, ranging from Meals on Wheels to trade-adjustment benefits.

The swift movement ahead left a residue of legal and fiscal uncertainties, even as NIH staff and clients cheered the outcome. For example, the Senate bill distributes NIH AIDS money through the NIH Office of AIDS Research, while the House version incorporates AIDS funds into the budgets of the individual institutes. With NIH officials acknowledging perplexity about what's permissible as a result of their unorthodox good fortune in Congress, meetings were planned last week to obtain guidance from the Office of Management and Budget.

Snow, however, intervened, closing Washington-area government offices on what was to be reopening day, Monday, January 8, and then on Tuesday and Wednesday, as well. The reopening of the many offices in the shutdown, for the first time since December 15, took place on Thursday, January 11, but then offices were declared closed again when a snow storm arrived on the 12th.

While NIH and the CDC appear to be financially safe for the rest of the fiscal year, the National Science Foundation remains precariously dependent on the continuing resolution that expires on January 26. Several factors account for the differing treatment of the Foundation and the two health-research agencies. Prime among them is the public's passion for the NIH and the CDC products, health improvement, which NSF cannot match.

The three agencies were prominently included in news accounts of the effects of closing down their offices. But NIH and CDC, by the nature of their duties, had a more appealing pitch. The *New York Times*, for example, reported that because of the closedown, enrollment of new patients in NIH clinical studies had been suspended and the NIH National Library of Medicine was no longer updating the data bases "used by doctors worldwide to get the latest treatment information." Also reported were concerns about disruptions in AIDS studies. The CDC said the shutdown was interfering with its tracking of the flu epidemic.

NSF can't offer comparable woes, as evidenced in a statement issued January 5 by Director Neal Lane. It said the shutdown was delaying the award of grants, interfering with the conduct of research, and "endangering the nation's science research and education base, and many of the advances the nation has come to take for granted will be in peril soon if this budget impasse isn't resolved."

The difference between the two agencies also extends to

### Clinton Still Vague on R&D

The White House continues to issue kind words but no numbers concerning its long-term spending plans for research and development. The latest production in the dollar-less style arrived last week in the seven-year balanced-budget plan that Congress demanded from the President as a condition for ending the government shutdown. The Republican plan, issued last year, generally calls for cutting all non-defense spending, including R&D, by one-third by the year 2002.

Clinton's response, heavy on telling where he will cut, but generally vague about spending intentions, states that the Administration's budget plan "also invests in science and technology, through a balanced mix of basic research, applied research, and technology development, much of it through cooperative projects with private industry."

"It adds funds," the budget plan continues, "for biomedical and behavioral research at the National Institutes of Health, for basic research and education at the National Science Foundation, for basic research at NASA (including Mission to Planet Earth), and for such important initiatives as the Advanced Technology Program and the Technology Investment Project."

How much does the President's plan invest and add? A query to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy brought no numerical reply, but it was pointed out that the Clinton seven-year budget provides for more discretionary spending than the Republican plan—and science money comes from the discretionary category.

Notable, along with the absence of numbers, are the references to "cooperative projects with private industry" and the technology programs—all anathema to the Republican Congress, and slated for oblivion.

the political combativeness of their respective constituencies. In the biomedical camp, there's an old tradition of vigorous lobbying and public squawking in behalf of NIH and health research, while, in contrast, the NSF constituency tends to be politically passive.

Ruminating on the lack of support for the Foundation, an NSF official last week told SGR that "the academics were quiet," which he attributed to the Christmas holiday season and the fact that for many university researchers, NSF is neither the biggest nor sole source of support. Moreover, he said, "NSF doesn't play the 'Washington Monument game,'" a reference to the venerable Interior Department tactic of threatening to close that popular tourist attraction when faced by a budget reduction. But serious attention is now being given, the NSF official said, to "stirring up" political

(Continued on Page 4)

## Research Agencies Digging Out from Long Closure

More deliberate than swift in the best of times, the government grant system was slowly emerging this week from a month-long shutdown that blocked the dispatch of hundreds of millions of dollars, left behind gluts of unopened mail, and caused the cancellation of numerous meetings on crucial questions of money and policy.

The accumulated mail at the National Science Foundation filled at least 40 rolling bins, each four-by-six-by-four feet, according to a somewhat distraught official at the Foundation's headquarters. The E-mail backlog on the terminals of NSF's thousand-plus staffers was termed incalculable. Throughout the shutdown, NSF was staffed by a skeleton crew of about a dozen officials who were deemed "essential," among them Director Neal Lane. But NSF was in a frozen state.

On the afternoon of January 5, a few hours before the House and Senate legislated a temporary solution to the shutdown, NSF issued an announcement saying that \$100-\$120 million in grants had been bottled up since December 15. The announcement added, "Dozens of proposal review panels, meetings, and workshops have already been cancelled or are threatened." The travel ban worked both ways, cutting off visits to NSF headquarters as well as the many trips that NSF staff normally makes to universities and professional meetings.

Long-planned site visits were called off, including one to MIT to review progress at that locale on one of the biggest projects in NSF's portfolio, the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory (LIGO). Faced with a big backlog of applications, NSF was pondering the cancellation of several planned solicitations, according to one official.

The National Institutes of Health, Washington's other big provider of research funds, was similarly demobilized in its outside dealings. Wendy Baldwin, Director of the NIH Office of Intramural Research, told SGR that at least 1000 grants were blocked in the award pipeline. Virtually no staff

was on hand to take calls from anxious grantees, and the voice mail systems were full.

The effects of the shutdown are likely to reverberate for some time beyond reopening day, since many long-planned study section meetings for reviewing grant applications were cancelled. Encountering NIH Director Harold Varmus at a meeting, SGR asked him whether there wasn't some elasticity in the system that could help cope with the financial disruptions, particularly among researchers dependent on NIH grants. "We can't do anything without money," Varmus replied.

While the administrative offices on the NIH Bethesda, Md., campus were lightly staffed by a tiny group of "essentials," large exceptions were allowed for patient care in the Clinical Center and attending to cell lines and other fragile activities in laboratories. Under these dispensations, about 6400 of NIH's 15,700 employees were officially at work during the shutdown; quite a few others are reported to have slipped into their labs to continue work.

After the paperwork backlog of the most recent shutdown is cleaned up, a more serious residue will persist in the form of dismay and demoralization among the civil servants who staff the federal government. The suspension of their work, as if it didn't matter greatly, has left many of them justifiably resentful. It is only in the US that politicians, aspiring and in office, can thrive by insulting and ridiculing government service. In other industrial nations, government employment is honored and government is recognized as an essential to civilization and social and economic advance.

Bill Clinton campaigned as a Washington outsider, claiming virtue in not being associated with the national government. The same illusionary advantage is claimed by several of his would-be Republican challengers, including those, like Lamar Alexander, Phil Gramm and Pat Buchanan, who have logged a lot of time in Washington.

The shutdown is a noxious byproduct of the denigration of public service. There should be little wonder that recruitment for government positions becomes ever more difficult.

### **Shutdowns** (Continued from Page 3)

support among the Foundation's clients.

Where were the friends of NSF in Congress at "cherry picking" time? There was no surge of support for NSF, but, according to a report, Chairman Bob Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee attempted to have NSF included among the agencies that would be assured funding through the fiscal year. Walker's appeal was turned down by Chairman Bob Livingston (R-La.) of the Appropriations Committee.

The NSF budget is part of a huge money bill that includes environment, housing, and veterans affairs, objects of intense ideological disagreement between Congress and the White House. With zero evidence of public concern about the shutdown of NSF, Livingston chose to leave it there, perhaps as a hostage, pending resolution of his more serious concerns with the Clinton White House.—DSG

### **Academy to Push R&D Plan**

The year-end holidays, disruptive politics, and bad weather have obscured one of the most ambitious proposals for remaking federal research policy, the far-reaching plan embodied in *Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology*, issued November 29 by a National Academy of Sciences committee chaired by Frank Press, former NAS President [SGR, December 1].

The plan calls for revamping budget definitions to provide a more accurate picture of federal R&D spending, and to give academic research the priority in budget allocations. With Congress back in session, Press and colleagues are planning to expound their ideas on Capitol Hill and in the science-policy community. They feel time is running short to fix the system.



## NSF Okays Consortium for Violence Research

A long-pending proposal for a Consortium for Violence Research has survived a bout of political jitters at the National Science Foundation, where final approval was voted last month by the National Science Board, policy overseer for NSF.

With only routine contractual details remaining to be completed, the program should begin by the end of January, according to its Director, Alfred Blumstein, Professor of Urban Systems and Operations Research at Carnegie Mellon University. Describing the enterprise as "a virtual consortium," Blumstein told SGR last week that present plans provide for participation by 39 researchers at 24 institutions in 11 states, Canada, the UK and Sweden.

The funding plan calls for \$12.2 million over five years, with NSF providing \$2 million a year, starting with \$2 million earmarked by Congress in 1994. The balance will come from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is in for \$2 million, and the Department of Justice, \$200,000 [SGR, November 15].

Backed by a report by the National Academy of Sciences, *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, the concept of a relatively large-scale violence-research program received influential legislative support in 1994, when the Democrats still controlled Congress. Rooting for it were the House and Senate chairs of NSF's appropriations subcommittees, Rep. Louis Stokes, of Cleveland, and Senator Barbara Mikulski, of Maryland. But by March 1995, when NSF's invitation for proposals was issued, the Republicans controlled Congress.

In May, the deadline for applications, Chairman Bob Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee suggested that NSF social-science programs were in-

festated by leftist values, and said he favored elimination of the NSF Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences [SGR, June 1]. In an interview with SGR [June 15], Walker specifically cited violence research, saying that it "just raises some red flags with me."

Hostility to the social sciences is not uncommon in conservative ranks. But Walker's views were especially noteworthy, since his Committee writes legislation for NSF. Alarms went off at the Foundation and among its academic clients. Following expressions of shock and pain from the social-science community, Walker backed off, declaring surprise at the "fuss" he had created.

The National Science Board, however, got the message, and decided on an extra-careful examination of the plans for violence research. After several postponements, the Violence Consortium was poised for approval at the mid-November meeting, but was sidetracked by federal Shutdown I, which cancelled the Board meeting. Approval was voted at a rescheduled meeting, December 14.

According to a social scientist who has closely observed the politics of the violence-research proposal at NSF, one third of the 24-member, part-time Board is suspicious of the social and behavioral sciences, one third is indifferent, and the rest are strong supporters.

However, approval was important for NSF's on-board managers, both as an issue of professional discretion in scholarly matters and to allay fears among social scientists that they're second-class citizens at the Foundation. Contributing to Walker's reversal on the social sciences was a visit from NSF Director Neal Lane, a physicist who is sensitive to the complaints from what some in his discipline refer to as the "soft sciences."

## After Long Slump, Industrial Firms Planning R&D Boost

While federal R&D is in the fiscal doldrums, the industrial sector is at its brightest in several years, according to an annual survey by the Industrial Research Institute (IRI), whose 257 member companies comprise most big-spending US high-tech corporations.

The survey, reported in the January-February issue of the IRI journal *Research-Technology Management*, found that average industrial spending on R&D for 1996 is projected at 6 percent over 1995—the biggest boost in six years. The 151 IRI member companies responding to the survey indicated that, as a percentage of sales, R&D would rise from 3.2 percent to 3.6 percent.

In 1996, 38 percent of the firms foresaw an increase in their R&D expenditures, compared to 27 percent last year. The firms were also upbeat about R&D hiring intentions, with 23 percent expecting new hires this year, whereas just two years ago, only five percent planned to add staff.

Twenty-four percent of the firms said they expected to increase funds for research in universities, up from 19

percent last year, and the highest since 1989. Plans for increases in "directed basic" research were reported by 17 percent of the companies; in the previous five years, the range on this item was 8-14 percent.

The survey found little interest in the Federal Research and Experimentation tax credit, touted by the Administration and many in Congress as a boon to industrial research.

The tax credit, which provides incentives for increasing industrial expenditures on research, was deemed by 55 percent of the applicable respondents as "not at all influential" in setting corporate levels of R&D. Only 5 percent of the firms said the tax credit exerted a "strong influence," while 28 percent responded that it has "somewhat" influenced their R&D planning.

(*Research-Technology Management*, published six times a year, \$55 for individuals; \$100 for institutions; plus \$40 for overseas airmail; order from: IRI, Suite 1100, 1550 M St. NW, Washington, DC 20005-1708; tel. 202/298-8811; fax 202/776-0756.)

## \$1.5-Million Drive to Boost NIH Planned by FASEB

With targets ranging from Presidential candidates to journalism schools, a \$1.5-million missionary campaign to boost the image and federal support of biomedical research is in the works by the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB).

The FASEB fund, to be spent over three years, has been redeployed from financial reserves of the Federation, an alliance of nine life-sciences societies, with some 40,000 members.

With its rank and file heavily dependent on grant support from the National Institutes of Health, just down the road from FASEB headquarters in Bethesda, Md., the Federation has in the past stimulated letters and visits to Congress in behalf of NIH. On the scale of lobbying efforts, that's minimal stuff. In contrast, the new campaign, approved in December by the FASEB Board, is to be a professionally directed, multi-front undertaking on a far grander scale than is customary in scientific lobbying.

According to the *FASEB Newsletter*, six "High Priority New Initiatives" have been developed with the assistance of a "strategic planning consulting firm," Clark & Weinstock, of New York, described by FASEB as having "worked previously with major clients in the corporate and not-for-profit sectors." Working on the FASEB project is the firm's Washington representative, former Minnesota Congress-

man Vin Weber, a Republican, who retired from the House in 1992.

The FASEB campaign will aim for statements of support for biomedical research from the 1996 Presidential candidates and their party platforms. It will also work on Congressional freshmen "to gain their support during the appropriations process." There's to be a major public-policy conference, in tandem with other organizations, "on the long-term support of biomedical research." And the campaign will be carried to "beltway 'think tanks'" to expand FASEB's influence, "particularly in the areas of policy and long-term planning."

FASEB also plans to tutor its new Board members on issues and techniques of politicking in Washington. And, finally, to expand access to the general public, FASEB says it will work on journalism schools and individual journalists to raise their appreciation of biomedical research.

Reflecting the squeamish, white-glove approach to politics which is characteristic of science pleaders in Washington, the FASEB scheme is devoid of any reference to what interests politicians most: campaign money.

As a tax-exempt non-profit, FASEB, of course, must avoid direct involvement in electoral politics. But for like-minded people who are so inclined, the law provides ways to raise money to help friends and punish enemies in politics.

## Job Changes & Appointments

**Gordon J.F. MacDonald**, Professor of International Relations, University of California, San Diego, has been appointed Director of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), a 17-nation research center near Vienna, Austria, founded in 1972, initially to warm east-west relations. MacDonald formerly was Chief Scientist of the MITRE Corporation, Executive Vice President of the Institute for Defense Analyses, and a frequent adviser to the Pentagon and the White House. The IIASA appointment is effective in August.

**Catherine Woteki**, Acting Associate Director for Science at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), moved this month to the post of Deputy Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics at the US Department of Agriculture. She succeeds **Floyd P. Horn**, who became head of the Agricultural Research Service in October, following the retirement last summer of **R.D. Plowman**.

At OSTP, **Ernest J. Moniz**, former head of the MIT Physics Department, has moved into the post of Associate Director for Science, following Senate approval in December of a backlog of nominations. Nominated in July, and on board since then, Moniz was innocently caught up in Congress's summer recess, a crowded agenda, and the general discord between Congressional Republicans and the Clinton White House.

In other staff changes at OSTP: **Jonathan Foster**, an attorney who has been Special Assistant to the head of the Federal Highway Administration, has been appointed General Counsel and Deputy Director for Management, succeeding **Holly Gwin**, who last year was appointed Counsel to the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans Illnesses.

**Tim Newell**, Assistant to the OSTP Director for Intergovernmental Affairs and Policy, has been named Deputy Director for Policy; **Sam Seidel**, formerly a policy analyst at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, specializing in aging and disabled-access issues, has been appointed a Research Assistant, and **Rick Borchelt** has been elevated from Public Affairs Specialist to Special Assistant for Public Affairs.

**Fitzhugh S.M. Mullan**, Director of the Bureau of Health Professions in the Department of Health and Human Services, retired January 1, and has been appointed an editor of *Health Affairs*, a quarterly journal published by Project Hope.

At the Washington-based Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives, one of the more robust and inventive lobbies for biomedical research, **Barbara Gill** has been appointed Executive Director, a post she'll hold while continuing as Vice President and Director of Public Affairs for the Charles A. Dana Foundation, of New York, parent of the Alliance. **Steven Foster**, the former Executive Director of the Alliance, continues as President of the Foundation.

# In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

**From the National Academy of Sciences Board on Agriculture:**

**Ecologically Based Pest Management: New Solutions for a New Century** (105 pp., \$49.95, plus \$4 for shipping), says pest "control" is largely futile for protecting crops, and resources should be shifted to ecological management, with emphasis on "the natural processes that suppress pest populations." The report, financed by the US Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency, states that "many standard agricultural practices disrupt natural processes that suppress pests." Describing current research as too narrowly focused and discipline-oriented for developing the ecological approach, the report states: "Institutional structures, including professional societies and academic departments, and consequently funding patterns for research, are largely responsible for the development of barriers that then become hardened through competition for limited research and extension funds and other types of institutional support and recognition." Following that indictment, the report praises the National Institutes of Health as a "successful model for coordinating problem-solving research." The report was produced by a 14-member committee chaired by Ralph W.F. Hardy, former CEO, Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Ithaca, NY. Mary Jane Letaw, of the Academy staff, was Program Officer for the project.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242 or 202/334-3313.

**From the Cato Institute, a libertarian, Washington-based research organization:**

**Science Without Sense: The Risky Business of Public Health Research**, Steven Milloy (68 pp., \$8), a ham-handed, low-wit attempt at humor, promising "everything you need to know about how to create a risk that will electrify the public, launch you into the pantheon of public health and land those big fat research grants from the federal government." The author holds degrees in law and public health and is Director of Science Policy at the National Environmental Policy Institute, Washington, DC, which contends that environmentalists dictate environmental policy.

Order from: Cato Institute Books, 938 Howard St., Suite 202, San Francisco, Calif. 94103; tel. 1-800/767-1241.

**From the Environmental and Energy Study Institute:**  
**1996 Briefing Book** (200 pp., \$75), latest edition of a useful annual guide to environmental politics, includes reviews of issues pending in the second session of the 104th Congress, summaries of federal environmental laws, a tour of the federal budget process, plus the relevant committees, members and staffs on Capitol Hill, etc.

Order from: Environment and Energy Study Institute, 122 C St. NW, Washington, DC 20001; tel. 202/628-1400; fax 202/628-1825.

**From the Environmental Law Institute, a green-tinted Washington think tank:**

**Environmental Crimes Desk Book** (415 pp., \$89.95), discusses the evolution of criminal enforcement of environmental laws, contains texts of the basic statutes and regulations and provides a guide for responding to allegations and investigations of environmental violations.

Order from: Environmental Law Institute, 1616 P St. NW, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 202/939-3844; fax (202) 939-3816.

**From the Aerospace Industries Association, Washington lobby for manufacturers of aircraft, engines, missiles:**

**Aerospace Facts & Figures: 1995-96** (170 pp., \$35), data on federal and industrial aerospace expenditures, R&D spending, employment by sector, international trade, etc.

Order from: Aerospace Industries Association, 1250 Eye St. NW, Washington, DC 20005-3922; tel. 202/371-8561.

**From the American Institute of Physics, no charge:**

**1994 Graduate Student Report** (Pub. R-207.27; 12pp.), says the slog to the physics PhD has increased from an average of 5.3 years in 1970 to 6.5 years in 1994; women in graduate physics rose from 4 to 15 percent of enrollments, and condensed matter was tops as the most popular subfield, with 26 percent of graduate students enrolled in that field. Elizabeth Dodge and Patrick J. Mulvey produced the report.

**1995 National Laboratory Workforce Report** (Pub. R-396.1; 4 pp.), based on a 1995 survey of 29 federally funded R&D centers, says they employed 3450 PhD physicists in permanent jobs and 600 postdocs, plus additional data. The report is by Jean M. Curtin and Christine Cassagnau.

Order from: AIP, Education and Employment Statistics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, Md. 20740-3843; tel. 301/209-3070; fax 301/209-0843.

## To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$490.00 ☐  
two years, \$840.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$40.00 per year; non-USA surface  
mail, \$20.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970  
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

# In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

## From the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD):

**Megascience Policy Issues** (237 pp., \$60), papers on the intricacies of international planning, cost sharing and management of major research facilities, prepared for the Megascience Forum, established in 1992 by the 25-nation OECD. Success, the report indicates, requires not only foresight, but pre-foresight, relentless champions, and good luck. Authors are W.J. McG. Tegart, Director, Australian Network for Research and Technology Policy, University of Canberra; Francois Jacq, Center for the Sociology of Innovation, Paris; Josef Rembser, Director, German-American Academic Council, Bonn; Katherine E. Barker, Program of Policy Research in Engineering, Science and Technology, University of Manchester, UK; and Albert H. Teich, Director, AAAS Science and Policy Programs.

**The Global Human Genome Programme. Megascience: The OECD Forum** (76 pp., \$21), reviews the role of international cooperation in genome research, calls for more collaboration, and indulges in the customary handwringing over balancing the benefits and injustices that may arise from knowledge of lurking diseases and disabilities.

**Continuing Professional Education of Highly-Qualified Personnel** (106 pp., \$32), advises academe, industry and government that rapid changes in technology and social organization require that formal education become an unending process for even highly trained workers.

Order from: OECD Publications and Information Center, 2001 L St. NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-4910; tel. 202/785-6323; fax 202/785-0350; also available from bookshops and OECD offices in major cities around the world.

## From the Allen Press, Inc., printer-publishers of scholarly, association and commercial periodicals:

**The Allen Press Study of 1996 Library Prices for Scientific and Medical Society Journals** (8 pp., no charge), 10th annual survey, with data from the American Library Association (ALA), major subscription agencies and the Allen catalog of 255 journals, says periodical prices over the past decade have increased at two to four times the Consumer Price Index, with the averages rising 9.6 percent in 1994 and 10.4 percent in 1995. Russian translations were tops in cost, averaging \$1033 per year, followed by chemistry and physics, with average prices of \$767, 13.3 percent higher than in 1994. Math scored the highest rate of price increase in 1995, 13.7 percent; medicine was up by 12.8 percent and psychology 10.9 percent, according to ALA data cited in the report.

Order from: Allen Press, Inc., 810 East 10th St., Lawrence, Kansas 66044; tel. 1-800/627-0629; fax 913/843-1274; e-mail: <rbuscher@allenpress.com>.

**From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:**  
**Higher Education: Selected Information on Student Financial Aid Received by Legal Immigrants** (GAO/HEHS-96-7; 26 pp.), reports that 390,000 legal immigrant students in 1992-93 received \$662 million in Pell Grants—non-repayable federal awards, of \$2400 maximum each, for needy undergraduates. This student group, about 10 percent of all Pell recipients, received 11 percent of the funds awarded. The GAO reported that 107,000 of the immigrants receiving Pell grants also received government-insured Stafford loans totaling \$257 million, about 6 percent of all Stafford loans that year. The immigrant Pell recipients were concentrated in California, 31 percent; New York, 25 percent; Florida, 8 percent, and Texas, 7 percent. The report was requested by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.) in response, the GAO noted, to proposals that would restrict federal benefits for legal immigrants.

**Former Soviet Union: An Update on Coordination of US Assistance and Economic Cooperation Programs** (GAO/NSIAD-96-16; 12 pp.), a brief follow-up to the GAO's February 1995 report (*Former Soviet Union: US Bilateral Program Lacks Effective Coordination*—GAO/NSIAD-95-10), which accused the US Agency for International Development (USAID) of a power grab in assistance efforts. In April, the report notes, the President strengthened the coordination powers of the State Department, and, "Since that time, relations among the agencies have improved, largely because of a change in the way funds are transferred and USAID's efforts to engender cooperation and coordination from other agencies." The GAO says it examined USAID relations with various US agencies, including the Centers for Disease Control, the FDA, the Departments of Agriculture and Energy, and EPA, but the report offers no details.

**Former Soviet Union: Information on US Bilateral Program Funding** (GAO/NSIAD-96-37; 136 pp.), calculates total US government aid to the ex-USSR at \$3.5 billion in expenditures (plus another \$2 billion in obligations, i.e., planned spending, and even more in loan guarantees) from 1990-94, with funds coming from 23 federal departments and agencies, including: DOE, \$122 million; NASA, \$117 million; NIH, \$14.3 million; NSF, \$6.3 million, and EPA, \$5.6 million. The biggest spenders were Agriculture, \$1.5 billion (including \$341,000 for scientific programs); USAID, \$851 million, and Defense, \$482 million.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

## From the National Wildlife Federation:

**1996 Conservation Directory** (522 pp., \$20 for Federation members; \$25 for others), a comprehensive inventory of conservation organizations and programs in federal and state governments, academe, the non-profit sector, etc., with descriptions, names and addresses of officials, plus statistical data on environmental matters, and much more.

Order from: National Wildlife Federation, Order/Contribution Department, 8925 Leesburg Pike, Vienna, Va. 22184-0001; tel. 1-800/432-6564.

(Continued on Page 7)



